

Rollins College Rollins Scholarship Online

Executive Committee Minutes

College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports

9-3-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 3, 2009

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 3, 2009" (2009). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 64.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/64

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

**Approved Minutes
Executive Committee
September 3, 2009**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Thom Moore, Jim Small, Lisa Tillmann, Allison Wallrapp, Laurie Joyner, Lewis Duncan, Roger Casey, Joan Davison

Guests:

- I. Call to order—the meeting comes to order at 12:40 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approves the minutes of April 9, 2009 and April 23, 2009 after Joyner requests an addition to clarify the minutes from April 23rd 2009 referring to “Harris said that Student Life asked PSC to propose bylaw to allow the Dean of Students to serve as an ex officio member of Student Life. [At this point in the meeting, Eck passed Joyner a note, and they exchanged some knowing looks. Very suspicious.] The committee also has asked to have its membership expended to have seat for a Student Affairs staff person.” Joyner explained the private exchange between Eck and her and asked the record to show “the suspicious exchange with Jim Eck related to a Holt issue that he was asking about and whether it should be brought up at EC. Since the issue had never been to the appropriate standing committee it seemed premature and so I said I did not think the timing was appropriate. As I recall the issue had to do with the possible integration of a couple of undergraduate majors, English and Music.” EC accepts the change.
- III. Announcements: Foglesong reminds the EC about its powers as a group and the individual role of members. Foglesong suggests changing the agenda and considering Old Business after New Business because of the expectation only voting members of EC would remain for the discussion of evaluation.
- IV. Committee Reports
 - A. Professional Standards Committee-Moore announces the committee needs another member elected at large. Moore identifies the committee work for the year.
 1. Evaluation of Administrators- this issue remains from last semester and requires ongoing discussion.
 2. CIE changes and tutorial-this issue also remains from last semester and the committee must assess changes and develop a tutorial to explain the CIE.

3. Maymester pay schedule-the issue developed because faculty members expressed concern regarding the pay schedule and questioned whether the pay was equitable. Foglesong mentions he too received e-mails regarding the fairness of pay and whether it is excessive. Joyner suggests the pay in Holt and intersession might be a more serious problem of fairness. Tillmann states concern about excessive pay is not a reaction to an absolute compensation but a relative term for those who feel undercompensated. Foglesong wonders if this is an F&S issue rather than a PSC issue. Davison suggests it should be PSC because of the reporting lines of F&S to the VP for Finance. She contends the academic officers should be involved in evaluations of the contributions of academic work. It is more appropriately an issue for the Dean of the Faculty than the VP of Finance. Joyner concurs that other comparable issues go to PSC. Joyner states the issue of international pay went to PSC. Tillmann asks whether the pay schedule is even an issue for faculty governance; perhaps it is an administrative issue. Joyner responds it is shared governance between the administration and faculty. Casey concurs and states this is a complex issue related to other compensation. Tillmann notes it is an issue of equity and therefore might be under the purview of F&S. Tillmann then suggests it might be preferable to have a colloquium. Foglesong suggests tabling the issue in the interest of time until the next meeting at which point the EC can decide whether the issue should be pursued and if so to which committee to send the issue.
4. Openly accessible database-PSC intends to form a subcommittee to consider faculty publications going into an openly accessible database. Duncan states he signed an agreement that any government funded research should go into an openly accessible database within a reasonable amount of time of publication.

B. Finance and Services Committee-Tillmann states the committee needs a second semester election to replace a sabbatical leave.

1. Faculty Presence at Board Meetings-Tillmann asked ongoing committee members Van Sickle and Schutz to investigate the issue of faculty presence on the board of trustees from the start. F&S is planning a colloquium to present data collected from peer/aspirant schools and to ascertain: Does the majority of faculty WANT a presence? If so, in what capacity (on the Board itself or committees) and with an observer or participant status? Finally, how would faculty members be chosen to represent the faculty on the Board?

2. Sustainability initiatives-F&S plans to continue to consider efforts to reduce waste, increase recycling availability/compliance, and investigate where Rollins gear is made and under what conditions. Duncan mentions Nielson already monitors the issue and Tillmann responds Nielson is attending one of their meetings. Tillmann points out Bitikofer's knowledge on greening of buildings.
3. Living wage at Rollins- the committee intends to discuss the issue with Eisenbarth.
4. Planning colloquium on socially responsible investing (institutional and individual)-Tillmann discussed with Eisenbarth the possibility of a colloquium and asked TIAA and Fidelity to send reps to a meeting to explain their conceptions of socially responsible.

C. Academic Affairs Committee-Small states AAC needs a replacement for a sabbatical and has vacancies on subcommittees.

1. Holt School-Small notes the strategic report of potential changes in Holt. He also notes AAC's increased involvement with Holt given the previous years efforts to integrate Holt into governance of college and with regard to have Holt courses move through normal committee process for course evaluation and program evaluation. AAC now is initiating discussions about evaluating graduate programs.
2. New Curriculum Pilot Program-AAC essentially monitoring introduction of RP but not intending to change the pilot program until after tested.
3. Miscellaneous-Small says the committee will continue to review major changes and new course introduction.

D. Student Life Committee-Boles

1. Housing- Last year's EC asked that the Student Life Committee in conjunction with Academic Affairs and the Dean of Student Affairs and Dean of Faculty convene a Forum on Housing (due to ATO/Chi Psi issues, Living Learning Communities, how housing preferences work and Faculty Involvement in this issue). Boles emphasizes housing is a broader issue than Greeks and should include themed and living learning housing. The Forum is scheduled for Sept. 18th from 3:30 to 5 in the Galloway Room. Email announcement will be sent out to faculty after EC meeting. Representatives of Residential Life and Greek Affairs are asked to

be present. Depending on the reaction at the meeting, Student Life will proceed accordingly.

2. Judicial Board-All faculty members of the Student Life Committee will now be part of the judicial hearing board. Regular members will be part of the faculty pool for the judicial hearing board. The chair will be the faculty member of the appellate board.
Rationale: Faculty members on SLC are elected to represent the faculty's perspective on Student Life. No place better does that exist than in the judicial process. Based on how faculty presence evolves, SLC may introduce language to change the by-laws description of the committee.
3. Social Honor Code-Boles states the Social Honor Code has been floating around for a couple of years without much progress. SLC now intends to work with SGA and the DOSA to produce a viable code. (Boles notes this probably will extend beyond a one year project.) Boles states Joyner announced at the retreat the faculty might want to delay the development of the code because of new issues demanding consideration. Boles again emphasizes he envisions a two year process. Wallrapp says she would like to attend Boles-Joyner meeting to discuss the Social Code. Joyner and Boles concur with her request. Joyner emphasizes she is a strong advocate of the Honor Code.
4. SLC Forum to discuss faculty leadership with student groups on campus and co-curriculum programs—Boles notes this issue overlaps with LLC and possibly PSC. Concern about faculty involvement with groups developed in response to a survey of the issue. Boles explains the issue might influence PSC in terms of how such service is counted. SLC probably will focus on the issue in the spring.
5. Amend membership in the SLC-This issue is held over from last year. The resolution suggests the Dean of Student Affairs should be a non-voting member and staff membership should increase to 3, with the requirement one staff member is from the Office of Student Involvement and Leadership. Davison states concerns expressed about this membership change in previous EC meetings. Foglesong asks about clarification of meeting on the 18th. Boles reiterates the purpose: how housing is chosen, what are priorities, and how involved do faculty wish to be in housing. Casey asks that the data of RO and process for evaluation of ROs be dispersed before meeting on 18th. Duncan states he would like a serious discussion about how segregated academic interests should become and whether housing based upon learning interests and

disciplines is desirable. Duncan mentions it might be beneficial to encourage disciplinary diversity rather than intellectual segregation. Foglesong suggests such segregation might be preferable to segregation based on personality preferences and drinking prowess.

6. In the spring the Student Life Committee will be meeting with Community Standards and Responsibility to update the Code of Conduct.
7. SGA-Wallrapp states SGA has a new constitution which it will put into action. The constitution includes the addition of a judicial board to promote checks and balances. Additionally Senate elections are changed so each class year now has guaranteed representation. RHA, IFC, LEAD, ACE, and PanHellenic also have one senator each with the hope to encourage collaboration and dialogue. Wallrapp continues SGA hopes to increase student awareness of SGA through transparency and weekly Sandspur articles. SGA will work on the Social Honor Code and consider its desire for a student on the Board of Trustees at least as a voice. Duncan asks whether Holt student representation should be on the EC. Foglesong and Tillmann both believe it would be nice to include a Holt voice. Discussion then focuses upon the relationship between A&S and Holt with diverse views expressed but consensus that some Holt student role is desirable.

V. New Business

- A. Dean of Student Affairs Position-Casey mentions Hater's role as interim Dean of Student Affairs continued in order to have the office's mission refined before a search commenced. He suggests a committee of 3 faculty, 1 or 2 student affairs people, and 1 student. Casey states he will work with Foglesong to bring a slate for the search. Moore then moves and Small seconds "We move forward with a search for Dean of Student Affairs, a search in which the interim may be a candidate." The motion receives unanimous support.
- B. Merit Pay Assessment-Foglesong introduces the issue of merit pay assessment noting he has received e-mail expressing concern about the assessment. Moore says PSC cannot spend time on the issue of merit pay assessment given other demands of the committee and ergo suggests the creation of a subcommittee which reports to PSC. Moore states the Merit Pay Appeals Committee will write a report outlining systemic issues that became evident in the appeals process which the merit pay assessment subcommittee subsequently might consider. Moore suggests either EC or

PSC should appoint this subcommittee of faculty which will report to PSC on reform of the merit pay process, similar to what was done for curricular reform. Moore elaborates that the process of election or appointment of the review subcommittee must be considered - possibly a slate sent for approval by the faculty or even members elected at large. Once constituted this review subcommittee will hold a forum and reach out to faculty. There also is a need to determine if and how to implement recommendations from the subcommittee. Duncan asks whether there is a move to end merit pay. Moore says this is not an issue. Small concurs the faculty accepted merit pay and desire to look at fair ways to implement merit and to evaluate how well the current system works. Moore says currently there are 7 appeals. Tillmann notes some people do question merit pay and whether to do it again and desire going forward a discussion about the merit of merit pay. Foglesong asks Moore for a recommendation on the subcommittee. Moore says EC should prepare a slate for the faculty. Foglesong notes now is not a good time to come up with slate and suggests EC work on the slate via e-mail. Duncan says the president's office is open to appeal on merit pay decisions related to the fundamental process. Foglesong then suggests skipping the agenda items related to transparency and the fall faculty party in the interest of time, and moving to a discussion of old business, administrative evaluation. Without objection, Foglesong asked that the ex-officio members of the committee withdraw for this section of the meeting, which concerns faculty evaluation of the Dean of Faculty.

VI. Old Business

- A. Dean of Faculty Evaluation—Foglesong suggests the EC should consider options of how to proceed with evaluation given only the Dean of Faculty was evaluated although the original intent was to evaluate administrators for the purpose of improving faculty-administration cooperation, shared governance, and relationships. Concern now exists the process is personalized rather than about the broader administrative relationship with A&S faculty. Foglesong suggests EC can decide to evaluate no one or continue with the procedure and invite the Dean of Faculty to respond to and discuss the evaluations. Discussion continues about the appropriate and desirable next step. Some consideration focuses on whether it is appropriate for the faculty to evaluate administrators, but the emphasis falls upon the desirability of the administration receiving faculty feedback. Foglesong suggests Joyner gave consent to be evaluated but she now can refuse to meet with EC and/or refuse to make a report to the faculty. Moore introduces the motion which Davison seconds, "to continue the process with Laurie's consent." The motion passes 4-1.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
VP/Secretary